



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/381,828	11/24/1999	ROLF SKOLD	2964-102P	4478

7590

09/28/2005

BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH
PO BOX 747
FALLS CHURCH, VA 220400747

EXAMINER

SODERQUIST, ARLEN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1743

DATE MAILED: 09/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/381,828

Applicant(s)

SKOLD, ROLF

Examiner

Arlen Soderquist

Art Unit

1743

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 July 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-2,4-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) 3 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 24 November 1999 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 1743

1. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In claim 9 it is not clear if the dosing organs include or are in addition to the dosage organ of claim 7. For examining purposes examiner is treating the claim as the component concentration control device further comprises another dosage organ to withdraw liquid from the measuring cell and the control program controls the dosage organs to withdraw and inject the same amount of fluid into the measuring cell each time the component concentration is changed.

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
3. Claims 1-2, 4-8 and 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tondre in view of Rouse and Dombay or Hagan (both newly cited and applied). In the paper Tondre teaches an automated device and method for the determination of isotropic microemulsion phases of ternary systems including a nonionic surfactant. The advantages and limits of an automatic procedure which permits the fast determination of the composition limits of isotropic microemulsion phases of water-oil-surfactant systems were determined. This system is based on detecting the temperature defining the lower and upper miscibility curves by the change of turbidity to study the solubilization of oil or water in binary mixtures of nonionic surfactants and water or oil and then reconstructing the usual ternary phase diagram at any chosen temperature. The method was especially well suited for the investigation of systems including nonionic surfactants which are very sensitive to temperature changes. Four systems

Art Unit: 1743

were tested including hydrogenated as well as fluorinated surfactants and oils. Data obtained for systems having neat turbidity changes were easy to interpret. For systems containing a liquid crystalline phase the turbidity-temperature curve was more difficult to interpret. The last paragraph of page 581 teaches that the method is particularly useful when dealing with expensive products that one cannot afford to prepare a sealed ampoule for each point of interest in the phase diagram. The apparatus is shown in figure 2 and is substantially similar to the claimed structure. Figures 3, 4, 5 and 6 show the temperature/turbidity data along with the concentration increments added. It is noted that the concentration increments in these figures are all within the claimed range. Tondre differs from the instant claims in that there is not a central computer to control the parts and the data is not displayed in a three dimensional diagram.

In the paper Rouse teaches automation of phase diagram recording. An automated titration system was developed for generating data to construct phase diagrams, which are extremely useful in the development of personal and household products. The authors describe the system and how it can be used to perform the technique of dual titration. A clear microemulsion sample is titrated with oil until the dispersion turns cloudy (defined to be a transmittance < 90%). This mixture is then dosed with a certain quantity of cosurfactant, more than enough to clear the mixture. The sample is again titrated with oil. This process continues until the sample no longer clears upon adding cosurfactant. The resulting measurements of oil uptake can be used to characterize the boundaries of the L1 or oil-in-H₂O microemulsion region of the phase space. Experiments for up to sixteen samples can be performed, each having individual setup and operating instructions. Features include completely automated operation, computer-controlled 2-speed mixing, viscosity detection at the end-point condition, and the storage of results in a computerized format. Page 14 teaches the calculation of the component concentration by the computer. Figures 1 and 6-7 show multidimensional representations of the data with figure 7 being a contour plot. From the experimental section it is clear that the device and method use a single vessel to which additions of a solution that changes the concentration of at least one of the components is added in increments. It is noted that the ethylene glycol monohexyl ether (C₆E₁) used in the experiments is a nonionic surfactant.

Dombay presents an investigation of emulgation and emulsion stability of thiocarbamate herbicides. Emulsification and emulsion stability (persistence in time) of thiocarbamate

Art Unit: 1743

herbicides (ethiolate, EPTC, cycloate and butylate) were investigated through photometric measurement of turbidity. Influence of various parameters were evaluated. Investigations included combined herbicidal formulations. Results were analyzed and represented by computer in three-dimensional diagrams. Figures 2-3 show three dimensional diagrams that were produced.

In the paper Hagan discusses a modular software-controlled electrochemical system. A modular microcomputer-controlled 3-electrode potentiostat configured with graphics is presented. The system was designed for metallic surface characterization and is capable of performing in different modes of operation including single sweep voltammetry, cyclic voltammetry, and chronoamperometry. An integrated and flexible software system for control, data taking, data storage, and transfer is described. Data analysis software for the IBM-PC computer including 2- and 3-dimensional plotting as well as menu-driven theoretical modeling, simulation, and curve fitting was developed. figure 12 shows a three dimensional diagram that was produced by the system. the last paragraph teaches that for the display of a number of data sets on the same page or screen simultaneously, a three-dimensional plot is often helpful since the curves often contain similar shapes over certain areas of the curve. The three-dimensional curve allows the intuitive appreciation of the dependent processes. In the first paragraph of the introduction Hagan teaches that the electrochemical processes are generally complex and sometimes difficult to determine accurately. An important step in the increase in accuracy and reproducibility of the measurements was accomplished by use of computer-controlled analysis. One such device is referenced and taught as capable of controlling most of the analytical techniques. the paragraph then teaches that opportunities presented by the rapid increase in computing power at the desktop level can be realized in new combinations of hardware and software. the availability of this computing power is bringing the capabilities of a main frame computer to the level of the desktop or laboratory computer. this new computing power is taught as having its most useful application in the areas of graphics displays, data processing and theoretical simulation of the phenomena under study. In the paragraph bridging pages 468-469 Hagan teaches that in order to provide the experimenter with the maximum information from the data and the greatest flexibility, an instrument must have the ability to store and recall the data

Art Unit: 1743

for display or access in either numerical or graphic form. the paragraph then describes benefits of data handling and display.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add the computer of Rouse, Dombay or Hagan and use it to store the data of Tondre and produce three dimensional diagrams of the data as shown by Rouse, Dombay or Hagan because of the ability to map out an emulsion property, overcome the tedious nature of the process and its extreme usefulness in the development of products as taught by Rouse or to gain the advantages of computing power now available at the desktop or laboratory level with their resulting benefits in display and interpretation of the data as shown by Dombay or Hagan. Additionally the Courts have held that providing a mechanical or automatic means to replace manual activity which accomplishes the same result is within the skill of a routineer in the art (see *In re Venner*, 120 USPQ 192 (CCPA 1958)).

4. Claims 3 and 9 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the any rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and/or to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The art of record does not teach or fairly suggest the method as claimed in which a volume of tested sample is replaced by an equal volume of liquid having the analyte at a concentration different than the tested sample to form a new sample for testing or an apparatus as claimed which has means to control the apparatus to perform the method of claim 3.

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. The newly cited and applied Dombay and Hagan references clearly teach the computerized 3-dimennsional, graphical presentation of data obtained from a series of experiments. The Dombay reference does this for experiments of emulsions, which is similar to the samples being investigated by Tondre. The Hagan reference, while directed to a different type of analysis, is directed to improvement of an analysis process by the addition of computing power. In this respect the introduction describes a known computer-controlled instrument capable of running the experiments under computer control. Hagan teaches adding computer data storage, data recall and data representation in two- and three-dimensional form as the next step in improving the instrument due to the availability of increased computing power at the desktop or laboratory level. The Hagan reference also teaches

Art Unit: 1743

that the three-dimensional plot is often helpful with multiple sets of data since the curves often contain similar shapes over certain areas of the curve. The three-dimensional curve allows the intuitive appreciation of the dependent processes.

Relative to the reopening of prosecution being improper, there are at least two factors that that applicant is overlooking. First, the search and examination are carried out based on the understanding of the claimed subject matter by the examiner. In the initial search an examiner attempts to perform a complete search based on the understanding of the invention at that time. With each action an update search is performed and the claims and previous rejection are evaluated in light of the art of record and arguments of applicant. The update search looks for any new references that have become available since the last office action. As prosecution proceeds, an examiner may determine that the initial search or any subsequent searches did not sufficiently cover the claimed subject matter due to claim amendments, applicant arguments that give new understanding to the scope of the terms used in the claims and/or an incorrect initial understanding of the claims by the examiner. In that situation, a further search of the art is appropriate. The search may uncover new references that are closer to the heart of the invention than were previously applied. The applied Tondre reference clearly is closer to the heart of the instant invention than the previously applied Franchini reference as it teaches apparatus and method in which the concentrations are changed by adding a solution of different concentration to the original sample container with successive or incremental additions and measuring a dependent property as the temperature is varied. It is always appropriate to apply this type of reference against the claims. A second factor is that the Tondre reference was identified as a reference of interest in a search that occurred prior to the office action that preceded the Appeal Brief, but was not available for examiner's consideration until after the office action had been mailed. As such it was not considered until the Appeal Brief was filed. Two references cited in this action are cited now due to a similar set of circumstances (Dombay and Wehrle).

Relative to the request for an interview, if examiner could see a way other than the indication of allowable subject matter already in the application, an interview would be appropriate. However, due to the current status of the application (an official response filed), an interview at this time is not appropriate and the request is denied. An appropriate time for an interview would be prior to filing of the next response. This would allow the interview to cover

Art Unit: 1743

a potential response to the office action in a timeframe that would allow incorporation of findings from the interview into the official response.

Relative to the 35 USC 112 2nd paragraph issues, the problem with claim 9 is that claim 7 defined the control equipment for controlling component concentration to be a dosing organ to add another liquid to the measuring cell. Claim 9 defines the equipment for control of component concentration as having one or several dosing organs for the withdrawal from and injection of liquid to the measuring cell. There is no connection between the dosing organ of claim 7 and the one or more dosing organs of claim 9. Thus it is not clear if the dosing organ(s) of claim 9 is the dosing organ of claim 7, include the dosing organ of claim 7 or is/are a completely different set of dosing organs. The changes made to claim 9 fail to clarify this issue and the rejection has been maintained.

Relative to issues with the art rejection it is noted that Tondre is dealing with the automation of a tedious manual procedure for its attendant time saving (page 582). The automation resulted in automated control to perform a set of experiments requiring temperature and composition changes. This also included an automated recording of the temperature and turbidity values with a double trace recorder (figure 3, for example and page 588). And the ultimate conclusion is that the automated procedure is well adapted to the determination of the phases in the microemulsions studied. Thus, the format of the data storage and the automated production of the phase diagrams are not taught by the Tondre reference. The Rouse reference is directed to the automation of phase diagram recording of microemulsions (title and abstract). In this reference, the data of the experiments is automatically recorded and stored in a computer (figures 2-3 and pages 38-40). The diagrams produced in the Rouse paper include three-dimensional diagrams and show the desirability of using a 3-dimensional representation of the data gathered. The tediousness of the process is the reason given for the desire to automate the process. Thus the Rouse paper is dealing with automation of the parts of the claim that the Tondre reference is not trying to automate. Additionally the types of samples (microemulsions) and the reasons for the automation (tedious process) are the same. This combined with the disclosures of the newly cited and applied Dombay and Hagan references does teach or suggest all of the limitations and provides both motivation and a reasonable expectation of success. In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon

Art Unit: 1743

improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971). In response to applicant's argument that Tondre and Rouse are nonanalogous art, it has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, both are in applicant's field of endeavor and are dealing with the automation of a prior analysis process and instrument. Additionally, the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981). In this respect a secondary reference might contain a pertinent teaching regarding the automation of an analysis process even though the analysis is of a different type because it is dealing with a problem common to automation of both types of analysis. This is the case with the combination of references currently applied and a consideration of the references in their entirety would show that each of the secondary references contain pertinent teachings regarding the automation of the Tondre instrument and process. Examiner notes that applicant asserts that the 3-dimensional diagrams of Rouse are produced by hand. If one looks at these figures, it is seen that these figures are reproduced from another reference. Since the reference referred to as the source of these figures is not of record in this application, applicant has no basis or support for the assertion that these diagrams were produced by hand. It is also noted that this assertion of a manual activity appears to qualify as an identification of manual activity (if it truly is a manual activity) that would properly trigger the automation of a manual process as found in the *In re Venner*, 120 USPQ 192 (CCPA 1958) case. The *In re Keller* Court decision is particularly relevant to the argument of inoperability. The suggested modification is not the replacement of

Art Unit: 1743

the Tondre analysis method with the Rouse analysis method, but an increase in the level of automation in the Tondre method and apparatus. If applicant thinks that examiner is trying replace the Tondre analysis method with the Rouse analysis method or vice versa, then the rejections have been incorrectly interpreted by applicant. Thus this argument is not persuasive because it is not commensurate in scope with or directed at the suggestion of the prior art as put forth by examiner.

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The cited references deal with the production of multidimensional phase diagrams.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Arlen Soderquist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1265. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday and Alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jill Warden can be reached on (571) 272-1267. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Arlen Soderquist

ARLEN SODERQUIST
PRIMARY EXAMINER